

BUSINESS MEETING
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
Business Meeting)
)
_____)

Transcript Excerpt
Cool Roof Coatings

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
HEARING ROOM A
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2006

10:05 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty
Contract No. 150-04-001

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Joseph Desmond, Chairperson

Arthur Rosenfeld

James D. Boyd

John L. Geesman

STAFF PRESENT

B.B. Blevins, Executive Director

William Chamberlain, Chief Counsel

Melinda Dorin

Elaine Hebert

Norman Bourassa

Ricardo Amon

Ram Verma

Heather Raitt

Gabriel Herrera

Gary Flamm

Michael Martin

Mark Rawson

PUBLIC ADVISER

Margret Kim

ALSO PRESENT

Gregory Tropsha
ICE Energy

Mark Skowronski
Solargenix

ALSO PRESENT

Joseph Rokowski
Rohn & Haaf
(via teleconference)

Les Guliassi
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Manuel Alvarez
Southern California Edison Company

Steven Kelly
Independent Energy Producers Association

Pete Palm
Western Pacific Distribution

Gary Fernstrom
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Steve J. Provol
Competitive Energy Insight, Inc.

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Items	1
1 Consent Calendar	1
2 Clean energy States Alliance	1
3 Moss Landing Marine Laboratory	3
4 Cool Roof Coatings Performance Requirements	8
5 California Commissioning Collaborative	14
6 Thomas F. Taranto	17
7 2005 Building Energy Efficiency Standards Credit Option	21
8 Overall Program Guidebook	27
9 Renewables Portfolio Standard Eligibility Guidebook	29
10 New Renewable Facilities Program Guidebook	40
11 2005 Appliance Efficiency Regulations Amendments	47
12 Minutes	63
13 Commission Committee Presentations/ Discussion	64
14 Chief Counsel's Report	91
15 Executive Director's Report	93
16 Legislative Director's Report	--
17 Public Adviser's Report	94
18 Public Comment	94
Adjournment	94
Certificate of Reporter	95

P R O C E E D I N G S

10:05 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Good morning. I'd like to welcome everyone here today to this business meeting. Would you please rise and join me in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Just as a reminder, if anyone wishes to address the Commission on various items be sure and notify us, blue cards here at the front.

First item on the agenda is the consent calendar.

COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I move the consent calendar.

COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So moved.

Agenda item number 2, the Clean Energy States Alliance. Possible approval of contract 500-05-036 for \$25,000 with Clean Energy States

1 Spillett. Not here? Okay.

2 Agenda item number 4. Cool Roof
3 Coatings Performance Requirements. Possible
4 adoption of proposed 15-day language amendments to
5 the 2005 building energy efficiency standards of
6 the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, part
7 6, section 118(i)3.

8 This is regarding performance
9 requirements of liquid roof coatings applied in
10 the field on nonresidential low-sloped roofs. Ms.
11 Hebert.

12 MS. HEBERT: Good morning,
13 Commissioners, colleagues. My name is Elaine
14 Hebert or Hebert, whichever mood you're in. And
15 I'm with the building and appliances office in the
16 efficiency renewables and demand analysis
17 division.

18 This item has been a long haul. On
19 April 13, 2005, the Energy Commission accepted a
20 petition to initiate a rulemaking to consider
21 changes to this one small section of the 2005
22 building standards.

23 There are two basic issues. First is
24 what are acceptable tests for testing the physical
25 performance of liquid applied roof coatings at

1 cold temperatures in order to show some kind of
2 durability in cold climates. As it turns out,
3 there are standards for such testing developed by
4 the American Society for Testing and Materials, or
5 ASTM.

6 The second issue is the thickness that
7 these coatings dry to, given in units of mils, to
8 insure some level of durability over a variety of
9 substrates.

10 To address the first issue, we are
11 proposing to add an extra optional ASTM test for
12 flexibility, adding it to the existing list of
13 tests for tensile strength and elongation at low
14 temperatures.

15 To address the second issue we are
16 proposing to remove the specified minimum dry mil
17 thickness of 20 mils, and instead allow the
18 manufacturers' recommendation for thickness or
19 coverage, taking the particular substrate into
20 consideration.

21 We are also adding the appropriate ASTM
22 standards to two sections of the building
23 standards that lists referenced documents. And
24 lastly, we are proposing some clarifying language
25 to section 118(i)3 such as adding the phrase, "for

1 low-sloped roofs" where appropriate, to remove any
2 ambiguity.

3 We have made these proposals with
4 substantial input from industry over the last
5 year. We thank industry members and other
6 stakeholders for working with us, and we look
7 forward to working with them to further refine our
8 roof coating standards for 2008 and the future.

9 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Great. Thanks,
10 Ms. Hebert. I would note we did have one speaker
11 on the phone who would like to address the
12 Commission. But first, let me ask the
13 Commissioners if they have any questions or
14 comments.

15 On the phone right now is Mr. Joseph
16 Rokowski of Rohn & Haaf. Mr. Rokowski?

17 MR. ROKOWSKI: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Please go ahead.

19 MR. ROKOWSKI: Just a few comments for
20 the record. I'll be pretty brief. There's been a
21 lot of controversy from suppliers regarding the
22 removal of the film thickness specification.

23 I think Elaine's done a commendable job
24 on handling all of that. I know there's been a
25 lot of controversy.

1 The concern is that this opens up the
2 opportunity for lower quality coatings out there
3 in the market. If a manufacturer decides to set a
4 specification that is very thin, it could last for
5 only a brief period of time on the roof. And that
6 could avoid the energy savings that everybody is
7 aiming for.

8 I mean we don't necessarily agree with
9 the 20 mil dry film thickness; we certainly don't
10 agree with the full removal of firm film thickness
11 spec'd for that.

12 We would recommend that it got switched
13 off to the delay of change to be switched in 2008
14 ruling. And I know that's underway, instead of
15 being changed for the 2005 regulations. I mean
16 we're not really tied to the 20 mil film
17 thickness. But the recommendation to remove it
18 occurred quickly. We think there's not been
19 enough time to air all the facts.

20 We'd like an organized and a systematic
21 assessment to occur before it was implemented, and
22 we think that's suitable in a 2008 timeframe.

23 I think there's a minimum film thickness
24 under which neither the State of California or the
25 elastomer roof coating industry needs will be met.

1 And that's kind of the basis for the comments.

2 That's all I have to say, thanks.

3 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Thank you, Mr.
4 Rokowski. Commissioner Rosenfeld.

5 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Elaine
6 Hebert, --

7 (Laughter.)

8 MS. HEBERT: I like the sound of that.

9 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I grew up in
10 Louisiana. Would you respond to this suggestion
11 that it be taken up again in 2008?

12 MS. HEBERT: I think that's a great
13 idea. We got a lot of education over the last
14 year. The 20 mils was based mostly for coatings
15 that have acrylics in them. We learned that there
16 are many other chemistries of coatings out there;
17 that some of them will perform well at less than
18 20 mils.

19 We tried a number of different angles to
20 address this. We ended up with the manufacturers'
21 recommendation. We figure it's going to be hard
22 to regulate; that people trying to go under the
23 radar screen or people trying to sell an inferior
24 product. We find it difficult to regulate how we
25 would control that inferior products would be out

1 there.

2 We hope to educate building owners who
3 will be making decisions about these products so
4 that they'll know perhaps, not always, but if you
5 spend little money you might get, you know, it's
6 buyer beware kind of thing.

7 So we hope to do some education so that
8 people will make informed decisions about the
9 products they buy for their roofs. It'll take
10 some time.

11 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: But our friends
12 at Rohn and Haaf can be comfortable that it will
13 get reconsidered?

14 MS. HEBERT: Yes, absolutely. And we're
15 counting on their help.

16 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Okay. Then I
17 move the item.

18 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
20 favor?

21 (Ayes.)

22 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
23 moved. And, Mr. Rokowski, thank you for your
24 comments. We'll make sure we keep an eye on that
25 and the staff pays close attention.

1 MR. ROKOWSKI: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: The next item on
3 the agenda, California Commissioning
4 Collaborative. Possible approval of contract 500-
5 05-035 for \$400,000 with the California
6 Commissioning Collaborative to develop
7 standardized commercial building commissioning and
8 retrocommissioning strategies and tools improving
9 building performance and reduce energy demand.
10 Mr. Bourassa.

11 MR. BOURASSA: Good morning,
12 Commissioners, Directors and attendees. My name
13 is Normal Bourassa, Bourassa if you want the
14 French pronunciation.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. BOURASSA: From the PIER buildings
17 program. This contract proposes building
18 commissioning research funded by the PIER electric
19 program. The total cost, as you just said, is not
20 to exceed \$400,000 over the three years.

21 Building commissioning is best defined
22 as a process of insuring that systems are designed
23 and installed, functionally tested and certified
24 capable of being operated and maintained according
25 to the owner's operational needs.

1 Ms. Kim, Public Adviser's report?

2 MS. KIM: I have nothing.

3 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Nothing to add,
4 okay. I had one, two last cards regarding public
5 comment here. Cindy Smith from Superior Products.
6 Didn't identify an agenda item, if she's still
7 here?

8 And then, as I said earlier, there was a
9 Peter Spillett from American Water. But, no.
10 Okay.

11 With that we'll conclude this meeting
12 and thank everyone for participating.

13 (Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the business
14 meeting was adjourned.)

15 --o0o--

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter,
do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person
herein; that I recorded the foregoing California
Energy Commission Business Meeting; that it was
thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of
counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said
meeting, nor in any way interested in outcome of
said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 5th day of May, 2006.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345